



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,173	09/29/2005	Ken'ichi Fujii	00862.023538.	4237
5514	7590	03/03/2010	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 1290 Avenue of the Americas NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800			NEURAUTER, GEORGE C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2443			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/03/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/551,173	FUJII ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George C. Neurauter, Jr.	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/4/2009</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are currently presented and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 28 October 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Serceki does not teach or suggest an interface unit adapted to receive a selection of a data processing function selected by an operator, a first transmission unit adapted to transmit a search request signal, to search for the wireless communication device capable of performing the data processing function selected by the operator, to a wireless device connected to the network connected to by said first connection unit, a second detection unit adapted to detect, among wireless communication devices connected to the network connected to by said first connection unit, a wireless communication device capable of performing the data processing function selected by the operator, based on a response signal that the wireless communication device connected to the network connected to by first said connection unit has transmitted in response to the search request signal transmitted by said first transmission unit and a display unit adapted to selectively display information associated with the wireless communication device detected by said second detection unit so as to determine a wireless communication partner.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The system of Serceki is contemplated to be operated on a client to connect to devices that offer services on a network (see paragraph 0006, specifically “It is now commonplace for computers and other types of

electronic devices to communicate with each other over a network. The ability for computers to communicate with one another has led to the creation of small networks comprising two or three computers and vast networks comprising hundreds or even thousands of computers. Networks can be set up to provide a wide assortment of capabilities. For example, networks of computers may permit each computer to share a centralized mass storage device or printer. Further, networks enable electronic mail and numerous other types of services. Networks are available in a wired configuration in which each entity on the network has a direct physical electrical connection to the network. More recently, wireless network technology has made it possible for computers and other types of electronic devices to access a network in a wireless manner.") The claimed invention as broadly interpreted by the Examiner merely describes a system that allows an operator to connect to services via a wireless network and the setup of such a connection. The recitation of a "data processing function" may be interpreted in a broad sense. The interpretation even allows for the "data processing function" to be the operator's intent to connect to an "access point" that would allow the operator to connect to the network because multiple access points could potentially be used to connect to the network.

The Applicant's arguments regarding Zero are also not persuasive for at least the same reasoning as has been previously presented by the Examiner and as shown above. Zero is a reference that is to be used in conjunction with other network devices in the same manner as discussed above.

The Examiner has cited references in this Office Action that the Applicant should consider when preparing a response to this action.

The Examiner is required to interpret the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. While the claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow (See *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The claims must also be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims in parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to distinctly define the claimed invention.

Therefore, the claims as currently amended are not in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication 20040102192 to Serceki.

Regarding claim 1, Serceki A wireless communication system comprising first (“wireless station” including a “wireless monitoring application”) and second wireless communication devices, wherein said first wireless communication device comprises:

an interface unit adapted to receive a selection of a data processing function specified by an operator;

a first detection unit adapted to detect a plurality of beacons at a plurality of

Art Unit: 2443

frequencies;

a first connection unit adapted to connect to a network configured by a base station that transmitted a beacon detected by said first detection unit, in accordance with identified by network identification information included in the beacon detected by said first detection unit to search for a wireless communication device capable of performing the data processing function selected by the operator via the interface unit; a first transmission unit adapted to transmit a search request signal ("attempt to associate") to search for the wireless communication device capable of performing the predetermined data processing function selected by the operator, to a wireless device connected to the network connected to by said first connection unit

a second detection unit adapted to detect, among wireless communication devices connected to the network connected to by said first connection unit, a wireless communication device capable of performing the data processing function selected by the operator based on a response signal that the wireless communication device connected to the network connected to by first said connection unit has transmitted in response to the search request signal transmitted by said first transmission unit;

a display unit adapted to selectively display information associated with the wireless communication device determined detected by said second detection unit so as to determine a wireless communication partner; and

a control unit adapted to, when the operator selects the information displayed by said display unit, while said first detection unit performs a detection process to detect the beacon, terminate the detection process of said first detection unit and execute

connection processing with a wireless communication device selected by the selected information, and

 said second wireless communication device comprises:

 a second connection unit adapted to connect to a network configured by a base station at a plurality of frequencies;

 a second transmission unit adapted to transmit a signal including self identification information as the response signal, when search request information is detected while the second wireless communication device is in a wireless reception waiting state on the network connected by said second connection unit at a predetermined frequency. (see at least paragraphs 0006, 0007, 0011 and 0012)

Claims 2 and 13 are also rejected since these claims recite in whole or in part substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2, wherein said second detection unit stores in a memory identification information of a wireless communication device on a partner side included in a response signal to the search request signal upon reception of the response signal, and said display unit selectively displays the identification information stored in the memory. (see at least paragraphs 0011 and 0012)

Regarding claim 6, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2, wherein when no signal is received in response to the search request signal within a predetermined period of time, an error display is made. (see at least paragraphs 0011 and 0012) (if no partner wireless communication device is found, the user would

inherently discover over a user selected period of time that no device is available and that the display's lack of showing an available device is indicative of such an error that no device is available)

Regarding claim 7, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2, further comprising: a determination unit adapted to determine if the beacon detected by said detection means is a beacon in an adhoc communication mode or a beacon in an infrastructure communication mode, and when said second determination unit determines that the detected beacon is the beacon in the adhoc communication mode, said transmission unit transmits the search request signal toward a wireless communication processing device as a generation source of the detected beacon, and when said second determination unit determines that the detected beacon is the beacon in the infrastructure mode, said transmission unit transmits the search request signal toward an access point. (see at least paragraphs 0007, 0008, and 0011)

Regarding claim 8, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2, further comprising registration unit adapted to register, in a memory, information associated with connection to the partner, wireless communication device, to which a wireless communication has been established. (see at least paragraph 0034) (the wireless station uses the information in a beacon frame to associate with the access point and stores the information for the connection)

Regarding claim 9, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 8, further comprising a mode for executing a process for establishing a wireless communication

on the basis of the information registered by said registration unit. (see at least paragraph 0034)

Regarding claim 11, Serceki disclosed a wireless communication system comprising first and second wireless communication devices, wherein said first wireless communication device comprises:

- an interface unit adapted to receive a selection of a processing function specified by an operator;
- a discrimination unit adapted to discriminate a type of device capable of executing the processing function selected by the operator via the interface unit;
- a determination unit adapted to, when receiving beacons transmitted from devices on wireless networks, determine whether device identification information corresponding to the type discriminated by said discrimination unit is included in the received beacons; and
- a display unit adapted to, selectively display information associated with a device that transmitted a beacon, including the device identification information corresponding to the type discriminated by said discrimination unit, and not to display information associated with a device that transmitted a beacon not including the device identification information corresponding to the type discriminated by said discrimination unit, and

 said second wireless communication device comprises:. (see at least paragraphs 0011 and 0012)

Claims 12 and 15 are also rejected since claims 12 and 15 recite substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 11.

Regarding claim 16, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2, wherein said data processing function includes at least one of a data printing function and a data saving function. (the “access point” provides Internet services, that may include saving of data at a remote location or at the access point itself for saving the connection information of the wireless communication device connecting to the “access point”)

Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by “The Windows XP Wireless Zero Configuration Service” (“Zero”).

Regarding claim 10, “Zero” disclosed a wireless communication device (computer executing the Windows XP operating system including the Windows XP Wireless Zero Configuration Service) that is configured to switch between a history search mode and a new search mode, and executes a communication process in each mode, wherein, in the history search mode, the wireless communication device communicates with a partner wireless communication device that had been communicated with previously, and wherein, in the new search mode, the wireless communication device communicates with a newly searched for partner wireless communication device comprising:

A storage unit (contained on the computer) adapted to store device identification information and network identification information of a partner to which the wireless communication device has been connected previously (“preferred network”; see also “Preferred Networks” on page 2); an instruction unit adapted to instruct one of the history search mode and the new search mode; a beacon detection unit that operates in the new search mode and that detects a beacon; a search unit adapted to, in the history

search mode, compare network identification information included in the detected beacon with the network identification information stored in said storage unit, cause said detection unit detect another beacon if there is a match in the compared network identification information, and search for a partner wireless communication device to communicate with based on new network identification information if the new network identification information is detected; a first display unit adapted to, in the new search mode, selectively display device identification information of a wireless communication device found by said search unit; a second display unit adapted to selectively display the device identification information of a wireless communications device stored in said storage unit in response to said instruction unit instructing the history search mode; and a wireless communication establishment process unit adapted to, when device identification information displayed by one of said first and second display unit is selected, execute a wireless communication establishment process with the wireless communication device specified by the selected device identification information. (see “preferred networks” on page 3 and “How the WZC service works on pages 4 and 5) (see also plural displayed windows on pages 2 and 3)

Claim 14 is also rejected since claim 14 recites substantially the same limitations as recited in claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serceki in view of US Patent 6,529,522 to Ito et al.

Regarding claim 4, Serceki disclosed the device according to claim 2.

Serceki did not expressly disclose wherein each of the wireless communication device and the partner wireless communication device comprises one of an image sensing device, a device for executing a print process of a sensed image, and a storage

device for executing a storage process of a sensed image, however, Ito did disclose these limitations (see at least column 8, lines 19-62)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of these references since both references disclose analogous subject matter regarding wireless communication devices and their connections with partner wireless communication devices and one of ordinary skill would have found that the substitution of a wireless communication device and a partner communication device with the image sensing device and a device for executing a print process of a sensed image would not introduce any unforeseen changes in the operation of the device of Serceki regarding wireless communications and would have reasonably predicted a successful combination of the wireless functionality of Serceki and the image sensing device and the device for executing a print process of a sensed image described in Ito.

Conclusion

The prior art listed in the PTO-892 form included with this Office Action disclose methods, systems, and apparatus similar to those claimed and recited in the specification. The Examiner has cited these references to evidence the level and/or knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to provide support for universal facts and the technical reasoning for the rejections made in this Office Action including the Examiner's broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as required by MPEP 2111 and to evidence the plain meaning of any terms not defined in the specification that are interpreted by the Examiner in accordance with

MPEP 2111.01. The Applicant should consider these cited references when preparing a response to this Office Action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Neurauter, Jr. whose telephone number is (571)272-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on the hours between 8:30am-5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger, can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George C Neurauter, Jr./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443